

Cable companies are  
gigantic enough. I  
shake my head &  
wonder what happened  
to this nation's  
anti-trust laws; I  
do not now & never  
will understand why  
cable companies are  
allowed to become  
monopolies. I was  
ALWAYS a VERY strong  
supporter of  
regulating cable  
because I lived in  
one or another area  
for the last thirty  
years where just to  
receive basic  
broadcast channels  
(that's right, the  
ones that are  
supposed to be free  
to access), and had  
to pay a cable  
company exorbitant  
money just to watch  
what was intended to  
be free. Thirty  
years ago it cost  
\$30.00 a month just  
to get what is now  
called "broadcast  
basic". I find that  
obscene.

Now I have over  
seventy channels. I  
still can't find

anything to watch  
most of the time,  
they all offer  
complete drivel.  
These seventy  
channels are  
controlled by what,  
three companies? Not  
that I can pick  
between which of the  
three companies I  
want to get cable  
from. I can get  
cable, or I can get  
satellite. They are  
NOT the same; they  
do not compete with  
each other as if  
they were. How so?  
Well, for one thing,  
by using the cable  
company we can get a  
truly fast internet  
connection. If I  
want that, I have to  
use the cable  
company; no  
satellite can offer  
me that. Why can't I  
have two, three, or  
more cable companies  
in my area that  
compete to provide  
similar services  
just like I go to  
the store and decide  
which detergent I  
want? If we only had  
one government

approved brand of detergent, it would suck, not get my clothes clean, probably give me a rash, and cost \$105.99 for a one gallon jug. Sounds just like cable to me.

If Comcast and Time Warner are allowed to merge with Adelphia, then the two companies will control nearly 50 percent of the national market. This will lead to even higher rates and even crappier service. This is a monopoly. Again I ask, what happened to our anti-trust laws?

Since cable was last deregulated, the price has sky-rocketed. After the price goes up, the companies are put under consumer pressure to justify the added cost and so they offer us

some new channels.  
Never enough to  
justify the added  
cost, however. We  
cannot pick which  
channels we want,  
whether in basic or  
premium services. We  
have to buy an  
exorbitantly priced  
package.  
Consequently, I have  
never had any  
“premium” channels.

Don't even get me  
started on cable  
modems, now they  
rent them, but when  
I got mine, I had to  
buy it. The thing  
cost me OVER  
\$600.00, I had to  
put it on my credit  
card & pay for it  
for less time than  
it survived. When I  
took it back to the  
cable store and told  
them it wasn't  
working, the nitwit  
said I couldn't  
possibly own it. He  
didn't work there  
back when they  
forced us to buy  
them. He had to get  
his supervisor  
before he would

replace my  
non-functional  
modem.

Between the internet  
connection and  
“BASIC” cable,  
remember I said NO  
“PREMIUM’ channels;  
my cable bill is  
\$90.00 a month. Does  
anyone besides me  
find this  
unacceptable???

If we allow more and  
more merging of  
cable companies,  
rather than allowing  
competition, we will  
see less and less  
community based  
television. Right  
now, if a consumer  
wishes to see a  
local program on  
public access  
channels, or local  
weather, or truly  
local news, they  
must use cable,  
because satellite  
does not offer this.  
Community based  
programming is now  
totally at the mercy  
of the humongous  
cable giants. If the  
humongous cable

giants decide this  
is not  
cost-effective for  
them, well then,  
Hulk smash. No more  
community based  
programs for us to  
watch. This too is  
unacceptable.